

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this Reply, claims 1-9, 15, and 16 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0130354 to Sekigawa et al. (Sekigawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,575 issued to Mistry et al. (Mistry).

Claim 1 recites the connecting region covering the substrate region between the insulating layers and between the control regions. The examiner relies on Mistry (Col. 3, Ln 20-33, 65-67 and Col. 4, Ln. 1-2) in rejecting this element.

It could only be assumed from the previous office action that the examiner was referring to the Schottky contact region as the connecting region which is only disclosed as “(d) a Schottky contact region providing a Schottky diode between the semiconductor body and the source region; and (e) a Schottky contact region providing a Schottky diode between the semiconductor body and the drain region.” From the interview, the examiner contended that the gate 45 constitutes both of the control regions of the claim. As such, the structure of the control regions has been further defined in relation to the substrate region and the connecting region. Accordingly, the cited text does not teach the structure as now claimed. The prior art does not suggest the connecting region covering the substrate region between the insulating layers and between the control

regions, where the control regions are located at mutually opposite sides of the substrate region.

The claimed elements provide a very well defined structural relationship between the covering area, the substrate region, the insulating layers, and the control regions. The defined structural relationship is not taught or suggested by any of the references. Therefore, for these reasons as well, the combination does not teach each of the elements of claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-7 and 15-16 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekigawa and Mistry as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,918 issued to Smith et al. (Smith).

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 1. Smith does not teach the elements noted above as missing from claim 1. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekigawa and Mistry as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0178670 issued to Fried et al. (Fried).

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Fried does not teach the elements noted above as missing from claim 1. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: September 14, 2009

/Robert K. Fergan/
Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000